

February 19, 2004

## INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TPM 20668RPL<sup>1</sup>; Log No. 76-02-053A/Choi Residential Subdivision

2. Description of Project:

The project proposes a minor urban subdivision in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area in an unincorporated area of San Diego County. The proposed parcel site is 7.89 acres and will be split into four (4) parcels of a minimum of 1.26 net acres each. There is an existing single-family residence to remain on Parcel 2. The new parcels will contain pads for single-family residences and detached garages. The proposed grading for the future residential pads and driveways consists of cutting 1,500 cubic yards at a maximum cut slope ratio of 1.5:1 and height of 20 feet and the filling of 1,500 cubic yards at a maximum fill slope ratio of 2:1 and height of 15 feet. The project contains Diegan coastal sage scrub and requires Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) findings and a Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). The project will take access from Mission Creek Road. The project will be serviced by the Fallbrook Public Utility District and the North County Fire Protection District.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Kevin Choi  
1002 Mission Creek Road  
Fallbrook, CA 92028

4. Project Location:

The project is located on the north end of Mission Creek Road between Mission Road and Aqua Hill Road. The street address is 1002 Mission Creek Road in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area, a community in the unincorporated areas of San Diego County. The APN is 123-120-34.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1047, Grid H/2

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The project site is located in a low-density rural-residential area of Fallbrook. Large lots with minor agriculture and single-family residences surround the proposed project, and Fallbrook Naval Weapons Station lies 0.5 miles to the west. The Station supports a known population of Stephen's Kangaroo Rat, and the parcel itself contains Coastal Sage Scrub.

6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Fallbrook  
Land Use Designation: 3 - Residential  
Density: 2 du/1 acre(s)
7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A70 – Limited Agriculture  
Density: 1 du/1 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: None
8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Biological Resources

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:  
  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650  
San Diego, California 92123-1666
10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:  
  
Luis Fernandez, Environmental Analyst, DPLU  
(858) 495-5393
11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

| <u>Permit Type/Action</u>   | <u>Agency</u>       |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Tentative Parcel Map        | County of San Diego |
| Clearing and Grading Permit | County of San Diego |
| Habitat Loss Permit         | County of San Diego |

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:  
  
Department of Fish and Game  
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Kray Van Kirk, Environmental Analyst, DPLU  
Luis Fernandez, Environmental Analyst, DPLU  
Lorrie Bradley, Staff Biologist, DPLU  
Megan Hamilton, Staff Biologist, DPLU  
Stephanie Hall, Current Planner, DPLU  
Nael Areigat, Project Manager, DPW  
Paula Barca, Civil Engineer, DPW

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project, which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

LUIS FERNANDEZ, Environmental Manager  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
Regulatory Planning Division

Date: February 19, 2004

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: February 129, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Choi Residential Subdivision

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TPM 20668RPL<sup>1</sup>; Log No. 76-02-053A

### EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

**"Potentially Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

**"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated."** County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

**"Less Than Significant Impact."** County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

**"Not Applicable."** County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

### I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policies 1.5 (CT) Country Town and General Plan Land Use Designations (3) Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of

.5 acres. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The current zone is A70 Use Regulation, which require a net minimum lot size of 1.0 acre. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is developed with estate residential. To the north, south, east and west are residential land uses. The proposed project is for a residential land use proposing 1.9 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, this project will be compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project is a minor subdivision, which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

## II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project site contains Unique Farmland. However, the project site does not currently support any significant agricultural operations. The project site encompasses a relatively small area of land, less than 7.89 acres, and is surrounded by development similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this project would result in residential infill and a significant conversion of farmland resources to non-agricultural use would not occur.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project site and surrounding area do not contain significant agricultural operations. In addition, the project and surrounding area are zoned for only Limited Agricultural Use, and the land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project site and surrounding area do not contain significant agricultural uses. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

### III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not displace existing residential uses because the site currently has an existing dwelling unit to remain. The addition of 3 dwelling units will yield a gain of available housing.

### IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a review of the original Negative Declaration and current photographs did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Visalia Sandy Loam, Fallbrook Sandy Loam, Cieneba Coarse Sandy Loam, and Cieneba Very Rocky Coarse Sandy Loam. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse potential for development activity.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

After reviewing the original Negative Declaration for the project site in addition to current photographs, no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The project will not result in a loss of availability of mineral resources that could be of value to the region. The project is located in a mineral resource area, known as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as identified



on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996. Also, after reviewing the original Negative Declaration for the project site in addition to current photographs, no significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region would occur.

## **V. WATER RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

### **No Impact**

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

### **No Impact**

The project lies in the Banal hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rye hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria and nutrients. However, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants, or land use activities that might contribute these pollutants.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: the construction of three (3) single-family residence pads in addition to the existing single-family residence and parcel. Potential pollutants for residential subdivisions include sediments, trash and debris, oil and grease, and pesticides from landscaping. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses:

Construction BMPs

Silt Fence  
Fiber Rolls  
Gravel Bag Berm  
Street Sweeping and Vacuuming  
Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit  
Spill Prevention and Control  
Water Conservation Practices  
Paving and Grinding Operations

Post Construction BMPs

Permanent landscaping  
Asphalt concrete over disturbed areas  
Outlet protection/velocity  
Either asphalt concrete or PCC placed over dirt driveway

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

A Service Availability Letter from the local water district has been provided indicating adequate water resources and infrastructure to provide requested water resources.

4. Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

**Yes**

The submitted minor Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) for this project received on December 12, 2003 meets current DPW criteria.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

According to the Drainage study received on December 12, 2002. The proposed project does not appear to substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would not result in

substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site. Drainage will flow in pre development drainage pattern.

6. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

According to the Drainage study received on December 12, 2002. The proposed project does not appear to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Drainage will flow in pre development drainage pattern.

7. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

According to the Drainage study received on December 12, 2002. The proposed project does not appear to substantially create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Drainage will flow in pre development drainage pattern.

8. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: *for San Luis Rey* – municipal and domestic supply; agricultural

supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: the construction of three (3) single-family residence pads in addition to the existing single-family residence and parcel. Potential pollutants for residential subdivisions include sediments, trash and debris, oil and grease, and pesticides from landscaping. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses:

#### Construction BMPs

Silt Fence  
Fiber Rolls  
Gravel Bag Berm  
Street Sweeping and Vacuuming  
Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit  
Spill Prevention and Control  
Water Conservation Practices  
Paving and Grinding Operations

#### Post Construction BMPs

Permanent landscaping  
Asphalt concrete over disturbed areas  
Outlet protection/velocity  
Either asphalt concrete or PCC placed over dirt driveway

9. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: *for San Luis Rey* – municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: the construction of three (3) single-family residence pads in addition to the existing single-family residence and parcel. Potential pollutants for residential subdivisions include sediments, trash and debris, oil and grease, and pesticides from landscaping. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses:

Construction BMPs

Silt Fence  
Fiber Rolls  
Gravel Bag Berm  
Street Sweeping and Vacuuming  
Stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit  
Spill Prevention and Control  
Water Conservation Practices  
Paving and Grinding Operations

Post Construction BMPs

Permanent landscaping  
Asphalt concrete over disturbed areas  
Outlet protection/velocity  
Either asphalt concrete or PCC placed over dirt driveway

10. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project will obtain its water supply from the Fallbrook Public Utility District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

11. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project will obtain its water supply from the Fallbrook Public Utility District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

12. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

**Not Applicable**

A Service Availability Letter from the Fallbrook Public Utility District has been provided indicating adequate water resources and infrastructure to provide requested water resources.

**VI. AIR QUALITY**

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 36 Average Daily Trips (ADT). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air

contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

**VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION**

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the Level of Service (LOS) of affected roadways. The nearest County Circulation Element road is Mission Road (SF 1305). Mission Road (SF 1305) is classified as a Major Road with bicycle lanes on the San Diego County General Plan Circulation Element. Mission Road, however, is not currently constructed to its ultimate width. In the vicinity of Mission Creek Road (project access), Mission Road is a two-lane road with existing traffic volumes of approximately 18,000 ADT (per SANDAG 2001 traffic flow map). Operating conditions on Mission Road is LOS E. Per SANDAG's trip generation tables, the traffic volume generated by the proposed project is 48 ADT (12 ADT/DU x 4DU) with approximately 5 trips during the morning and evening peak hours. During the peak hours this would be less than one additional trip every ten minutes. These volumes are very low and would not be noticeable to the average driver. The additional traffic generated by the proposed project would not substantially increase congestion, alter level of service or substantially increase queuing along

Mission Road. The additional traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in a significant traffic impact on Mission Road.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

The project may have impacts on traffic safety. The project will be certified, by the private engineer, that it has adequate sight distance prior to final occupancy and that all driveways are built to County Standards. The applicant will be required to design and construct all public and private roads per the County Public and Private Road Standards

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with The Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on any County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

**VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**



The site contains 1.86 acres of coastal sage scrub and .14 of non-native grassland, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. The project will be conditioned to purchase off-site habitat credits totaling 3.72 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat and .07 acres of non-native grassland in a County approved mitigation bank, land trust or conservancy prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to approval of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Yes**

Sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site. The project site contains 1.86 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and .14 acres of Non-native grassland. However, the project will not complete any development, grading, grubbing, clearing, or any other activity that will damage the sensitive habitat lands without providing adequate mitigation. Mitigation for impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub will consist of purchase off-site habitat credits totaling 3.72 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat and .07 acres of Non-native grassland in a County approved mitigation bank, land trust or conservancy prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to approval of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Article IV, Item 6 of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed,

channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or waters of the U.S that could potentially be impacted, diverted or obstructed by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or water of the U.S in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

No linear features (drainages, ridges, valley or linear-shaped patches of native vegetation) that connect areas of native vegetation or natural open space were identified on the site from a review of previous environmental documents and recent photographs. Therefore, the site is not expected to be used as a wildlife dispersal corridor and will not impact the dispersal of wildlife.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

**Not Applicable**

The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

**Yes**

The project has been found to conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance.

**IX. HAZARDS**

1. Would the proposal present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter, dated 5/23/02, has been received from the North County Fire Protection District.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not significantly increase the amount of runoff because it does not propose a significant change in the character of the site with regards to impervious surfaces. The project will have no adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate

or amount of runoff because it does not propose to impair, impede or accelerate flow in any watercourse. The project does not have significant flood hazards or siltation problem from any sources.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Not Applicable**

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

5. Would the proposal expose people to any other demonstrable potentially significant health or safety hazard not listed above?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

No other health or safety hazard has been identified in the review of the proposed project.

**X. NOISE**

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposal would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations. Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposal would not generate potentially significant adverse noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

## **XI. PUBLIC SERVICES**

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: North County Fire Protection District, and Fallbrook Public Utility District, will provide water and fire services. The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies. The schools indicate that the project is eligible for service. The project is accessed by Mission Creek Road, an existing 60-foot wide private road, therefore, emergency access is adequate.

## **XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES**

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;  
Communication systems;  
Water treatment or distribution facilities;  
Sewer or septic tanks;  
Storm water drainage;  
Solid waste disposal;  
Water supplies?

### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. North County Fire Protection District, and Fallbrook Public Utility District, will provide water and

fire services, will provide water, sewer and fire services. See Section X for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

### **XIII. AESTHETICS**

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project is not visible from a designated scenic vista, overlook or viewpoint according to the Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan; therefore, a demonstrable potentially significant adverse effect is not foreseen.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of less than 15 percent gradient. Minor grading is proposed for 3 single-family dwelling units. The site has previously been graded for the existing dwelling unit, accessory structure and agricultural operations. The AEIS application states that .28 acres are to be graded with a volume of cut and fill at 1,500 cubic yards. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

#### **Yes**

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are steep slopes on the property, however, an open space easement is proposed over the entire steep slope lands. Therefore, the project is in conformance with the RPO.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

**XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

**Yes**

The property has been surveyed by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist/historian and it has been determined that the property does not contain any archaeological/ historical sites.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
  - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
  - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
  - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;

- d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
- e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project will not impact significant archaeological resources since prior grading of the property has eliminated any potential for buried archaeological features.

**XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE**

None.

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**

The site contains 1.86 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and .14 acres of Non-native grassland, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. The project will be conditioned to purchase off-site habitat credits totaling 3.72 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat and .07 acres of Non-native grassland in a County approved mitigation bank, land trust or conservancy prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to approval of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur.

- 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**



The site contains 1.86 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub and .14 acres of Non-native grassland, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. The project will be conditioned to purchase off-site habitat credits totaling 3.72 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat and .07 acres of Non-native grassland in a County approved mitigation bank, land trust or conservancy prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to approval of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

#### **Less Than Significant Impact**

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/ Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

**XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS**

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A.
3. Mitigation measures: N/A

**XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

Biological Assessment, Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc., Revised 11 December 2003.

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division  
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,  
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701  
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b,  
Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

Drainage Analysis, Piro Engineering, November 2002

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board  
General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects

Traffic and Parking Study, Federhart & Associates, December 1, 2002

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology